

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gryglewicz (US Patent No 6,993,502) in view of Wilmes et al. (US Patent No 7,313,538). Claims 4, 11, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gryglewicz in view of Wilmes and further in view of Sullivan (US Publication No. 2003/0055754 A1). Applicants submit that the claimed subject matter is allowable for the reasons that follow.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Gryglewicz in view of Wilmes fail to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, these references do not disclose, *inter alia*, “a plurality of tax tables stored in a single location with the plurality of tax calculators.” See claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include this feature and contend that it is not disclosed in Gryglewicz, Wilmes, or Sullivan. Applicants contend that Wilmes does disclose a database “including data tables or lookup tables” (Col. 4, lines 27-28); however, the data tables in Wilmes do not correspond to the plurality of tax tables of the claimed invention. Moreover, Wilmes fails to provide storage in a single location with the plurality of tax calculators. In addition, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to

disclose, *inter alia*, “a table update system configured to receive updates for the plurality of tax tables and update the plurality of tax tables.” See claim 1. As such, Applicants contend that Gryglewicz in view of Wilmes and further in view of Sullivan does not teach all the features of claim 1.

Applicants submit that the Office presented similar rejections with respect to independent claims 8 and 15. Accordingly, Applicants have made similar amendments to these claims. Therefore, Applicants incorporate the foregoing arguments with regard to claim 1 and contend that claims 8 and 15 are not disclosed by Gryglewicz in view of Wilmes. Furthermore, since claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-19 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also not disclosed by Gryglewicz in view of Wilmes. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection of all claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elaine Chi/

Elaine Chi
Reg. No.: 61,194

Date: September 24, 2008

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Telephone (518) 449-0044
Facsimile (518) 449-0047